Theory of arbitrarily polarized quantum Hall states

Sudhansu S. Mandal and V. Ravishankar

Department of Physics, Indian Institute of technology, Kanpur – 208 016, INDIA

arXiv:cond-mat/9506071v3 11 Sep 1995

Abstract

We propose a global model which accounts for all the observed quantum Hall states in terms of an abelian doublet of Chern-Simons gauge fields, with the strength of the Chern-Simons term given by a coupling matrix. The model is employed within the composite fermion picture.

PACS numbers: 73.40.Hm, 11.15.Bt, 73.20.Dx

Typeset using REVTEX

The quantum Hall effects in two dimensional systems are observed [1,2] at high magnetic fields ($B \sim 10$T). In such a case, the spin degree of freedom of the electron gets frozen in the direction of the magnetic field (which is perpendicular to the plane of the system) and has no dynamical role. Thus one assumes that the electrons are spinless for these fully polarized quantum Hall (QH) states. The situation changes, however, when B becomes relatively small: the Zeeman splitting is now not that large (also partly due to small g value, $g \sim 0.4$) and, as Halperin [3] has observed, these systems are not fully polarized. Indeed, experiments reveal that at relatively small values of B, the QH states at filling factors $\nu = \frac{4}{3}$, $\frac{8}{5}$, $\frac{10}{7}$ [4,5] and $\frac{2}{3}$ [6,7] are unpolarized while the states at $\nu = \frac{3}{5}$ [7] and $\frac{7}{5}$ [4] are partially polarized. Further, it is also known experimentally that the states which are at maximum polarization to start with pass over to partially polarized or unpolarized states as the Zeeman energy is lowered sufficiently — either by reducing the tilting angle of the magnetic field [4–7] or by decreasing the electron density [6]. In the vanishing Zeeman splitting (VZS) limit, it has been found from numerical computations [8] that the states with $\nu = 2/(2n+1)$ are unpolarized and those of the Laughlin sequence [9] with $\nu = 1/(2n+1)$ are fully polarized, in the thermodynamic limit. Also the state at $\nu = \frac{3}{5}$ has been found to be partially polarized by an exact diagonalization study [10], in agreement with experiments.

Wu, Dev and Jain [11] have studied this problem and constructed trial wave functions by employing the composite fermion model (CFM), proposed originally by Jain [12]. These trial wave functions are confirmed to be exact by numerical computation. They report that, in the VZS limit, all even numerator QH states are unpolarized and all those states with both the numerator and denominator (of ν) odd are partially/fully polarized. Further, Belkhir and Jain [13] have proposed that the CFM accommodates the sequence $\nu = 2n/(3n+2)$ all of which are spin unpolarized. From the wave functions that they construct, they also interpret that these states possess a new feature where each composite fermion carries two different types of vortices — one of which seen by all electrons while the other is visible only to an electron of like spin.

We present here a generalized and consistent study of QH states in an arbitrarily po-

larized state within the frame work of Chern-Simons (CS) theory, in the same spirit as the study of Lopez and Fradkin [14] for fully polarized states. To that end, we introduce a doublet of CS gauge fields

$$a_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} a_\mu^\uparrow \\ a_\mu^\downarrow \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1}$$

and let the strength of the CS term be matrix valued and have the form

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 & \theta_2 \\ \theta_2 & \theta_1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{2}$$

We adhere to the CFM, i.e., we insist that each electron have an even number of vortices attached to it, although the Aharonov-Bohm phase picked up by one electron around the other can be spin dependent.

The model described below bears a striking resemblence to a similar model proposed recently by Lopez and Fradkin (LF) [15] in order to describe QH effect in double layered systems. In remarking so, we emphasize that the models are *not* equivalent and the results for the double layered systems do not go over automatically to the spin systems at hand here. Further elaboration will be taken up after we analyse our model in detail.

Consider a two-dimensional system of non-relativistic spin-1/2 electrons in the presence of magnetic field perpendicular to the plane. In their study of spinless fermions, Lopez and Fradkin [14] have shown that such a system is equivalent to the one interacting with a CS gauge field. Using this generic argument we write a generalized Lagrangian density as

$$\mathcal{L} = \psi_\uparrow^\dagger \mathcal{D}(a_\mu^\uparrow)\psi_\uparrow + \psi_\downarrow^\dagger \mathcal{D}(a_\mu^\downarrow)\psi_\downarrow + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{a}_\mu \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\Theta\partial_\nu a_\lambda \, . \tag{3}$$

Here ψ is the fermionic field and $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ represent the spin up and down respectively. $\mathcal{D}(a_\mu^s) = iD_0^s + (1/2m^*)D_k^{s\,2} + \mu + (g/2)\mu_B(B + b^s)\sigma$ with $D_\mu^s = \partial_\mu - ie(A_\mu + a_\mu^s)$ where A_μ is the external electromagnetic field and a_μ^s is the CS field which interacts with the particles having spin indices $s = \uparrow, \downarrow$. (We have chosen the units $\hbar = c = 1$.) The fixed density of particles in the system is implemented by the introduction of chemical potential μ which

acts as a Lagrange multiplier. e and m^* are the charge and effective mass of the electron respectively. Note that the Zeeman term comprises of both the external magnetic field B and the CS field b^s. μ_B is the Bohr magneton, $\sigma = +1(-1)$ for spin-up(down) electrons and finally, $\tilde{a}_\mu$ is the transpose of the doublet field a_μ. The action given by Eq. (3) is invariant under the gauge transformations $a_\mu^{\uparrow,\downarrow} \rightarrow a_\mu^{\uparrow,\downarrow} + \partial_\mu \lambda^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(x)$, $\psi_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(x) \rightarrow \exp[ie\lambda^{\uparrow,\downarrow}(x)]\psi_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(x)$. It should be emphasized we are within the abelian CS theory.

The above Lagrangian density has several interesting features. Let us diagonalize the matrix Θ, with eigen values $\theta_\pm = \theta_1 \pm \theta_2$, and denote a_μ in the eigen basis by

$$a_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} a_\mu^+ \\ a_\mu^- \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{4}$$

By simple rescalings Eq. (3) may be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \psi_\uparrow^\dagger \mathcal{D}(a_\mu^+ + a_\mu^-)\psi_\uparrow + \psi_\downarrow^\dagger \mathcal{D}(a_\mu^+ - a_\mu^-)\psi_\downarrow + \frac{\theta_+}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} a_\mu^+ \partial_\nu a_\lambda^+ + \frac{\theta_-}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} a_\mu^- \partial_\nu a_\lambda^- \ . \tag{5}$$

The relevant equations of motion now read

$$\mathcal{D}(a_\mu^+ + a_\mu^- \equiv a_\mu^\uparrow)\psi_\uparrow = 0 \ \ ; \quad \mathcal{D}(a_\mu^+ - a_\mu^- \equiv a_\mu^\downarrow)\psi_\downarrow = 0 \ ; \tag{6a}$$

$$\theta_+ b^+ = -e(\rho_\uparrow + \rho_\downarrow) \equiv -e\rho \ \ ; \quad \theta_- b^- = -e(\rho_\uparrow - \rho_\downarrow) \equiv -e\Delta\rho \ , \tag{6b}$$

where $\rho_\uparrow(\rho_\downarrow)$ is the density of spin up (down) particles. It is clear that the above equations naturally incorporate the idea that each electron has two kinds of vortices associated with it.

Case–I: We first study the case $\theta_1 = \theta_2$. Here $\theta_+ = 2\theta$ and $\theta_- \equiv 0$. Thus the CS gauge field a_μ^- decouples dynamically and merely plays the role of a Lagrange multiplier: $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial a_0^-} = \Delta\rho \equiv 0$. Thus the unpolarized case is accomplished by the choice $\theta_1 = \theta_2$. Rescaling θ by $\frac{\theta}{2}$, we parametrize $\theta = \frac{e^2}{2\pi}(\frac{1}{2s})$ (s is an integer) in order to impose composite fermion picture on the model. Note that the ensuing CFM is different from the one envisaged by Belkhir and Jain [13] who distinguish between the relative phase between like spin particles and unlike spin particles for singlet states. In this model, there is no such phase distinction.

The determination of the filling fractions is now straight forward. Since there is only one CS gauge field a_μ^+, a standard mean field (MF) ansatz leads to an average CS magnetic field $\langle b^+ \rangle = -\frac{e\rho}{\theta}$ which is seen by *all* the electrons. Demanding that the effective Landau levels (LL) formed by the effective magnetic field $\bar{B}^+ = B + \langle b^+ \rangle$ accommodate all the particles at an integer filling factor $2p$, (p for up spin and p for down), the true filling fraction ν is obtained as

$$\nu = \frac{2p}{4sp+1} \; . \tag{7}$$

The energy corresponding to each level is obtained as $\varepsilon_{n\sigma} = (n+1/2)\bar{\omega}_c - \frac{g}{2}\mu_B \bar{B}^+ \sigma$ ($n = 0, 1, \ldots$), where the effective cyclotron frequency $\bar{\omega}_c = \frac{e}{m^*}\bar{B}^+$. All the states obeying Eq. (7) are spin unpolarized. Recall that p can be a negative integer (meaning $\bar{B}^+$ is antiparallel to B). Note that the sequence (7) is exactly the same that was obtained by Wu et al. [11], and does indeed accommodate all the known experimentally observed states and also maintain consistency with the numerical result that all even numerator states are unpolarized. In the limit $p \to \infty$, $\nu \to 1/(2s) \Rightarrow$ that all even denominator states are also unpolarized. Further by particle-hole symmetry, the states $2-\nu$, and the states $2+\nu$ which are obtained by the addition of LL [11], are also unpolarized. It is indeed true that the even-numerator levels such as $\nu = \frac{4}{3}$, $\frac{8}{5}$ and $\frac{10}{7}$ [4] and even-denominator state like $\nu = \frac{5}{2}$ [16] have been experimentally observed to be unpolarized.

Case–II: We now consider the case $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2$ in order to obtain partially polarized states. In the diagonal basis $\theta_\pm = \theta_1 \pm \theta_2 \neq 0$. The study of the Lagrangian now offers several novel features. The phase picked up by a spin around a like-spin is different from what it would pick up around an unlike-spin. Moreover, the MF ansatz now involves smearing two fields $b^\pm$ which are unequal. We find that

$$\bar{B}^\uparrow = B + b^+ + b^- \;\; ; \quad \bar{B}^\downarrow = B + b^+ - b^- \tag{8}$$

are respectively the fields seen by spin up and spin down particles. Consequently there are two energy scales corresponding to the two gaps at the MF level. We again implement the composite fermion requirement. This leads to the condition

$$-e\left(\frac{1}{\theta_+}+\frac{1}{\theta_-}\right)=-\frac{2\pi}{e}(2s)\ . \tag{9}$$

However allowing the unlike spins to pick up fermionic as well as bosonic phases we get

$$-e\left(\frac{1}{\theta_+}-\frac{1}{\theta_-}\right)=-\frac{2\pi}{e}k\ , \tag{10}$$

where k is an arbitrary integer.

Let us parametrize $\theta_\pm = (e^2/2\pi)(1/s_\pm)$. Demanding that exactly $p_\uparrow(p_\downarrow)$ numbers of effective LL be filled by spin up (down) electrons, we obtain

$$\frac{\rho_\uparrow}{p_\uparrow}=\frac{\rho}{\nu}-[\rho s_+ +(\Delta\rho)s_-]\ , \tag{11a}$$

$$\frac{\rho_\downarrow}{p_\downarrow}=\frac{\rho}{\nu}-[\rho s_+ -(\Delta\rho)s_-]\ . \tag{11b}$$

Note that if $\Delta\rho = 0$, s_- is irrelevant. In other words, the requirement of unpolarized spin states causes a collapse to Case-I. Solving for $\Delta\rho$ and ν we obtain

$$\frac{\Delta\rho}{\rho}=\frac{p_\uparrow - p_\downarrow}{p_\uparrow + p_\downarrow + 4s_- p_\uparrow p_\downarrow}\ , \tag{12a}$$

$$\nu=\frac{p_\uparrow + p_\downarrow + 4s_- p_\uparrow p_\downarrow}{1+(s_+ + s_-)(p_\uparrow + p_\downarrow)+4s_+ s_- p_\uparrow p_\downarrow}\ . \tag{12b}$$

Observe that $\Delta\rho \neq 0$ if and only if $p_\uparrow \neq p_\downarrow$. Note that for $\Delta\rho = 0$, s_- (being an irrelevant parameter) needs to be dropped. It is not too tedious to verify from a one-loop computation that the Hall conductivity gets quantized at precisely those values of ν (given by Eqs. (7, and 12)), subject to the weak restriction $\lim_{\mathbf{q}^2\to 0} V(\mathbf{q}^2)\mathbf{q}^2 = 0$, where $V(\mathbf{q}^2)$ is the electron interaction potential.

We study the extreme case $s_- = 0$, i.e., $\langle b^-\rangle = 0$ first. The CS field a_μ^- is decoupled at the tree level (in contrast to the unpolarized states where a_μ^- is completely non-dynamical). Consider then the sequence $p_\uparrow = p_\downarrow + 1 = p$. Then

$$\frac{\Delta\rho}{\rho}=\frac{1}{2p-1}\ \ ;\ \ \nu=\frac{2p-1}{s_+(2p-1)+1}\ . \tag{13}$$

We have $s_+ = 2s$ by virtue of composite fermion requirement. Thus

$$\nu=\frac{2p-1}{2s(2p-1)+1}\ . \tag{14}$$

These states are indeed partially polarized becoming fully polarized when $p = 1$. Then $\nu_{p=1} = 1/(2s+1)$ which is simply the Laughlin sequence [9] known to be completely polarized [8]. The case $s = 1$ yields the sequence obtained by Wu et al. [11]. Particle-hole symmetry and the addition of LL imply again that $2 - \nu$ and $2 + \nu$ are also spin-polarized. It turns out that the sequences given by Eqs. (7 and 14) exhaust all known integer and fractional states — with full, partial or no polarization.

The model can accommodate many more states corresponding to $\bar{B}^{\uparrow} \neq \bar{B}^{\downarrow}$. As an interesting exercise, let us construct the sequence of states that would follow from Belkhir and Jain proposal [13]. This corresponds to the choice $k = 2s-1$ in (10), whence, $s_+ = (4s-1)/2$ and $s_- = 1/2$. We obtain

$$\frac{\Delta\rho}{\rho} = \frac{p_\uparrow - p_\downarrow}{p_\uparrow + p_\downarrow + 2p_\uparrow p_\downarrow} \; ; \tag{15a}$$

$$\nu = \frac{p_\uparrow + p_\downarrow + 2p_\uparrow p_\downarrow}{1 + 2s(p_\uparrow + p_\downarrow) + (4s-1)p_\uparrow p_\downarrow} \; , \tag{15b}$$

which clearly is a new sequence.

In general, the family of sequences is given in terms of four independent parameters ($p_\uparrow$, $p_\downarrow$, s_+, s_-) subject to the composite fermion constraint —- $s_+ + s_- = 2s$ (an even integer). It raises the interesting question of the uniqueness of the ν values obtained. We note that the sequences are indeed different, and any accidental degeneracy (i.e., same ν value from different sequences) does not make the model ambiguous. For, it would correspond to different gap energies, which can be determined, say, by the activation of diagonal resistivity. In short, the QH states are labeled by both ν as well as $\bar{\omega}_c^{\uparrow,\downarrow}$. It is interesting that all states that are known so far correspond to $\bar{\omega}_c^{\uparrow} = \bar{\omega}_c^{\downarrow}$.

It remains to contrast our results with those of LF [15] who studied double layered systems. As we observed, there is a close resemblance between the two models: The Lagrangians are formally the same, with a fermion doublet and a matrix valued CS strength. The crucial difference, however, is in the (physical) choice of Θ. While $\Theta_{\rm LF}^{-1}$ is well defined in Ref. [15], it is Θ that is so in our case. This leads to certain fundamental differences in results and interpretation which we list below:

(i) Consider the spin unpolarized state first. The corresponding sequence of states obtained by LF [15] for equal population in the two layers is identical to Eq. (7) here. A closer look however shows that it precisely for these states, (characterized by the filling fractions $\nu_1 = \nu_2$ in the two layers and the number of particles $N_1 = N_2$ in two layers in Ref. [15]) that the CS strength $\Theta_{\rm LF}$ becomes ill-defined. The ensuing dynamics is also ill-defined. Indeed as LF [15] point out in their paper "the spin singlet state (3,3,2), which has filling fraction $\nu = 2/5$, cannot be described within the Abelian Chern-Simons approach". Observe that, in contrast, our Θ is well-defined (albeit Θ^{-1} is not, but that is irrelevant), and we have shown that the choice $\theta_1 = \theta_2$, naturally leads to unpolarized states. The dynamics is also well defined, allowing us to perform the standard one-loop computation to verify quantization of Hall conductivity σ_H at these filling fractions and also derive the many-body wave function for singlet states thereof [18]. (ii) Consider the states $\nu = 1/m$. In our approach, odd m always corresponds to fully polarized states while m even can be a spin unpolarized state. Contrarily in Ref. [15], one can have (analogues of) unpolarized states for all m (even or odd). Clearly, our choice is closer to the experiment [7] and numerical calculations [8] in a single layer. (iii) Consider the state $\nu = 1/2$. For their physical states (i.e., in agreement with numerical computation), LF [15] assign $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 1/4$ yielding gaps $\bar{\omega}_c^{1,2} = \omega_c/4$ (where 1 and 2 refer to two different layers). The present model, in contrast, yields $\bar{\omega}_c^{\uparrow,\downarrow} = 0$, which is again closer to the experiments [19–21] which have verified that $\bar{\omega}_c = 0$ for $\nu = 1/2$ in a single layer. (iv) It is not that the two models are entirely dissimilar in their prediction. Indeed, the double layered systems are exact analogues of the spin systems with dissimilar gaps for spin up and down states. Note that spin unpolarized states (which are seen experimentally [4–7]) can never arise if $\bar{\omega}_c^{\uparrow} \neq \bar{\omega}_c^{\downarrow}$. Experimentally observed partially polarized or fully polarized states also correspond to $\bar{\omega}_c^{\uparrow} = \bar{\omega}_c^{\downarrow}$. (v) Finally, we remark that LF [15] have also studied spin unpolarized states by employing a non-abelian CS interaction, with additional new features such as semion statistics obeyed both by the charged spinless holons and neutral spin-1/2 spinons — which indicates a departure from CFM to which we completely adhere. A comparision of this SU(2) model with the abelian formalism developed

here merits further study.

To conclude, we have developed a global model for all the observed QH states in terms of a doublet of CS fields with the coupling matrix of form (2). Our findings are consistent with the exact results obtained numerically as well as by experimental observations. Finally, there remains the determination of the wave functions for these states from the Lagrangian (5) following the beautiful method developed by Lopez and Fradkin [17]. We report here that for the state $\nu = \frac{2}{5}$, the Halperin wave function [3] is remarkably recovered, as a striking vindication of the model. The details will be reported else where [18].

We thank the referees for their insightful queries and suggestions.

REFERENCES

[1] K. von Klitzing, G. Dorda and M. Pepper, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 494 (1980).

[2] D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1559 (1982).

[3] B. I. Halperin, Helv. Phys. Acta **56**, 75 (1983).

[4] R. G. Clark, S. R. Haynes, A. M. Suckling, J. R. Mallett, P. W. Wright, J. J. Harris and C. T. Foxon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1536 (1989).

[5] J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Stormer, L. N. Pfeiffer and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1540 (1989).

[6] J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Stormer, L. N. Pfeiffer and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. **B 41**, 7910 (1990).

[7] L. W. Engel, S. W. Hwang, T. Sajoto, D. C. Tsui and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. **B 45**, 3418 (1992).

[8] T. Chakraborty and F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **B 29**, 7032 (1984); F. C. Zhang and T. Chakraborty, *ibid.* **30**, 7320 (1984); E. H. Rezayi, *ibid.* **36**, 5454 (1987).

[9] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).

[10] P. A. Maksym, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **1**, 6229 (1989); T. Chakraborty and P. Pietilainen, Phys. Rev. **B 41**, 10862 (1990).

[11] X. G. Wu, G. Dev and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 153 (1993).

[12] J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199 (1989); Phys. Rev. **B 41**, 7653 (1990).

[13] L. Belkhir and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 643 (1992).

[14] A. Lopez and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. **B 44**, 5246 (1991).

[15] A. Lopez and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. **B 51**, 4347 (1995) and references quoted therein. See, in particular, X. G. Wen and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1811(1992); Phys. Rev. **B**

47, 2265 (1993) where multicomponent CS fields were first introduced and J. Frohlich, T. Kerler and P. A. Marchetti, Nucl. Phys. **B 374**, 111 (1992) who first employed SU(2) CS action to study QH effects.

[16] R. L. Willett, J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard and J. H. English, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1776 (1987).

[17] A. Lopez and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2126 (1992); see also E. Fradkin, Nucl. Phys. **B 389**, 587 (1993).

[18] S. S. Mandal and V. Ravishankar, preprint cond-mat/9506079.

[19] R. L. Willett, R. R. Ruel, K. W. West and L. N. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3846 (1993).

[20] W. Kang, H. L. Stormer, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. Baldwin and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3850 (1993).

[21] V. J. Goldman, B. Su and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2065 (1994).